

259

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M No.44637 of 2016
Date of Decision: 19.01.2018**

**RANDHIR SINGH & ORS Petitioners
Vs
STATE OF HARYANA & ORS Respondents**

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. Sandeep Singh Ghanghas, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Neelam Kashyap, D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Balwinder Singh Brar, Advocate for
Mr. Amrainder Singh, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

[1]. Prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.127 dated 23.04.2011 registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 341, 325, 506 IPC at Police Station Matlauda, District Panipat (Annexure P-1) as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

[2]. Vide order dated 27.07.2017, both the parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate for recording their respective statements in respect of genuineness of the compromise in question.

[3]. In pursuance of the aforesaid order, both the parties have already appeared on 01.08.2017 before the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Panipat and have deposed in respect of genuineness and voluntary nature of the compromise in question. The Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Panipat has also endorsed the genuineness of the compromise vide its report dated 01.08.2017.

[4]. This Court is of the opinion that in view of compromise between the parties, chances of conviction of the accused are remote and there is minimal chance of the witnesses coming forward to depose in support of prosecution version. In view of remote chances of conviction, it would be appropriate to exercise discretionary power of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to put an end to the controversy for all times to come. The compromise would facilitate both the parties to live in peace and to maintain public tranquility and offence in question is personal in nature and does not involve any heinous and serious offence of any mental depravity, nor it involves any offence covered under Prevention of Corruption Act. Therefore, when possibility of conviction is remote and bleak, continuation of criminal proceedings would put the accused to oppression and prejudice. In such a situation the exercise of power to quash the proceedings would be in consonance with the

provisions of law to meet ends of justice and to prevent unnecessary continuation of proceedings which may ultimately result in some unnecessary vagaries of criminal trial.

[5]. Learned State counsel, however, objects to the aforesaid course, but in order to prevent unnecessary continuation of criminal proceedings on the ground that there are bleak chances of conviction in the case, this Court is of the opinion that it would be in fitness of things to quash the proceedings on the basis of compromise. The compromise in question is fully in consonance with the guidelines framed in **Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052** and **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Crl.) 543.**

[6]. Resultantly, FIR No.127 dated 23.04.2011 registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 341, 325, 506 IPC at Police Station Matlauda, District Panipat (Annexure P-1) as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed.

[7]. Petition stands disposed of.

January 19, 2018

Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No